



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

3-26-03
3/RESPONSE
RECEIVED
MAR 26 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

In re Application of:

Dorothy B. Franks et al.

Serial No.: 09/620,520

Filed: July 20, 2000

For: AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION
OF MEDICAL STAFF TRAINING
NEEDS

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Group Art Unit: 3714

Examiner: John Sotomayor

Atty. Docket: GEMS:0091/YOD
15-SV-5494

Assistant Commissioner
for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 37 C.F.R. 1.8	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on the date below:	
March 14, 2003	<i>Helen Tinsley</i>
Date	Helen Tinsley

**RESPONSE TO
OFFICE ACTION MAILED JANUARY 14, 2003**

Dear Sir:

In the Office Action, claims 1-28 were rejected. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as discussed below in greater detail. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

First Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 8-10, 23, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Callahan (U.S. Pat. No. 6,416,328). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness falls on the Examiner. *Ex parte Wolters and Kuypers*, 214 U.S.P.Q. 735 (PTO Bd. App. 1979). Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to